

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claims 1-66 remain pending with claims 1, 27, 48 and 49 being independent. Claims 1, 27, 36, 45, 46, and 48-66 have been amended.

For the reasons set forth at pages 2-21 of the office action, claims 1-66 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over various combinations of HFD, Net Nanny, Robb, Sadowsky, Martyn, Ng, Samit, Gardenswartz, Donaldson, Woods, Kay Krantz, Kramer, and an assertion of official notice. These rejections and their underlying rationale are traversed in their entirety.

As presented, each independent claim now recites that a first user of the modular computer program can make a selection of information (e.g., a subset of dynamic pricing information) to be presented to a second user of the modular computer program. Support for this feature is found in the application as filed throughout the specification as a whole and specifically in Fig. 19 and at page 43, lines 7-21, which provides:

Figure 19 may depict a functional flow diagram of a way the system may support the e-mail transfer of navlets between different locations and users. Here, for example, the navlet 1910 and a first participant or location 1900 may contain a control 1904 to e-mail the navlet 1901. The e-mail control 1904 may pass arguments that contains information sufficient to identify the page at which the navlet is receiving information 1922 or from which IP broadcast or multicast IP address the navlet is receiving information. The passed information may be used as text information for an e-mail program 1912 designated by user 1900 through browser preference controls. The user may then include additional text to the e-mail and designate an e-mail address to send the navlet. The user may then send the e-mail 1916 and select the URL passed by argument from the navlet 1901. The URL may invoke a browser 1918 at user B to pass a URL containing arguments to a tracking database 1924. The tracking database may respond with a navlet 1920 that receives an argument to pull information or 'tune,' e.g., enter a session with, the taxonomic

broadcast 1922 that was the data source for the navlet 1901 at a new instance of the navlet 1902.

The art of record – regardless of how it may hypothetically be combined – fails to disclose or suggest the claimed selection feature. The claimed selection feature is an important aspect as it allows, among other advantages, a first user of the program to select and send items of interest or a class of interest to a second user of the program.

The remaining claims each depends directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable for the reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable and for reciting allowable subject matter in their own right. Independent consideration and allowance of the dependent claims are requested.


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

12/14/04



John C. Phillips
Reg. No. 35,322